



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/911,829	07/25/2001	Tsuyoshi Tamura	110196	6319
25944	7590	02/25/2004	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			NGUYEN, KEVIN M	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2674		15
DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/911,829	TAMURA, TSUYOSHI	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Kevin M. Nguyen	2674	

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.   |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

## DETAILED ACTION

1. During the personal interview with the applicant's representative on 02/11/2004, the rejections of the previous Office action is hereby withdrawn. An action as follows:
2. The information disclosure statements filed 9/5/2001, 11/9/2001, 11/29/2002, and 5/9/2003 which have been placed in the application file, the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 6, 21 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akimoto et al (IDS equivalent to US 6,329973) in view of Shimamoto (US 6,147,672).

As to claim 1, Akimoto et al teaches a memory driver comprising:

a first port (an interface 2, fig. 1) through which the still image data (a still image data memory 6, fig. 1),

a second port (an interface 2, fig. 1) through which a moving image data (a moving image decoder 3, fig. 1),

a RAM (a still image memory 6, fig. 1) storing the still image data;

a first control circuit (the still image output circuit 41 and a still horizontal direction selecting circuit 42, fig. 1) controls writing of the still image data with respect to the RAM (a still image memory 6, fig. 1);

and a second control (the still image data is sequentially inputted to the write signal generating circuit 17, col. 4, lines 25-26) with respect to the RAM (a still image memory 6, fig. 1);

a display section (a display pixel array 18, fig. 1).

Akimoto et al teaches all of the claimed limitations except for a reception circuit which differentially amplifies the differential signal input from the second port and creates the moving image data in a parallel state.

However, Shimamoto teaches a LCD panel comprising a reception circuit (103) which differentially amplifies the differential signal input from the second port and creates the moving image data in a parallel state (see figure 10, column 8, lines 58-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Akimoto's interface including the reception circuit (103) which differentially amplifies the differential signal input from the second port and creates the moving image data in a parallel state, in view of the teaching of Shimamoto's reference because this would prevent an influence of electric wave radiation on the ambience, improve a high resolution display mode, and reduce the number of interface signal lines (col. 2, lines 36-41 of Shimamoto).

As to claim 6, Shimamoto teaches the serial transfer line is a transfer line in accordance with an LVDS standard (col. 3, lines 60-61).

As to claim 21, Akimoto et al teaches column drivers (42, 44, fig. 2), row drivers (51, 52, fig. 2).

As to claim 26, Akimoto et al teaches an MPU (a parent device 31, col. 1).

4. Claims 11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akimoto and Shimamoto, and further in view of Silverman et al (US 6,370,603).

As to claims 11 and 16, Akimoto and Shimamoto teach all of the claimed limitations, except for the serial transfer line is a transfer line in accordance with a USB standard and an IEEE 1394 standard.

However, Silverman et al teaches the serial transfer line is a transfer line in accordance with a USB standard and an IEEE 1394 standard (column 8, lines 19-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Akimoto's interface including the serial transfer line is a transfer line in accordance with a USB standard and an IEEE 1394 standard, in view of the teaching of Silverman's reference because this would provide an improved technique for effecting digital communications between digital devices and system using different communication protocols (column 4, lines 10-13 of Silverman et al).

5. Claims 2-5, 7-10 and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akimoto et al and Shimamoto as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Chida (newly cited, US 6,313,863).

As to claim 2, Akimoto et al and Shimamoto teach all of the claimed limitations of claim 1, except for a data validation signal generation circuit.

However, Chida teaches a halt control circuit (a system control unit 26, fig. 1). A validity table 26-1 manages validities of each image block designated by a validity designating unit 36. A special coded data table 26-2 manages a special coded image. A static image table 26-3 manages a static image. A validity designating unit 34 designates validities of each block of an image in accordance with instructions from the system control unit 26 that controls a control unit 34 based on the validity table 26-1 (fig. 1, col. 4, lines 23-30).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Shimamoto's reception circuit including a data validation signal generation circuit, in view of the teaching of Chida's reference because this would improve the quality of an image that is transmitted through a communication channel or line, and improve a quality image in an acceptable amount of time from a partner's terminal (col. 2, lines 40-45 of Chida).

As to claims 3-5, Chida teaches when the receiving side displays only the valid area, the system control unit 26 of the receiving side controls the synthesizing/processing unit 125 so that unit 125 extracts a part of the image stored in the receiving video RAM 121 based on the validity information of the blocks (fig. 11a, col. 9, lines 48-52).

As to claims 7-10, Shimamoto teaches the serial transfer line is a transfer line in accordance with an LVDS standard (col. 3, lines 60-61).

As to claims 22-25, Akimoto et al teaches column drivers (42, 44, fig. 2), row drivers (51, 52, fig. 2).

6. Claims 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akimoto et al and Shimamoto, and further in view of Silverman et al.

As to claims 12-20, Akimoto et al and Shimamoto teach all of the claimed limitations except for the serial transfer line is a transfer line in accordance with a USB standard and an IEEE 1394 standard.

However, Silverman et al teaches the serial transfer line is a transfer line in accordance with a USB standard and an IEEE 1394 standard (column 8, lines 19-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Akimoto's interface including the serial transfer line is a transfer line in accordance with a USB standard and an IEEE 1394 standard, in view of the teaching of Silverman's reference because this would provide an improved technique for effecting digital communications between digital devices and system using different communication protocols (column 4, lines 10-13 of Silverman et al).

### ***Conclusion***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Kevin M. Nguyen** whose telephone number is **703-305-6209**. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-THU from 9:00-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Richard A Hjerpe** can be reached on **703-305-4709**.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Art Unit: 2674

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

**(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)**

Hand-delivered response should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Kevin M. Nguyen  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2674

KN  
February 20, 2004



XIAO WU  
PRIMARY EXAMINER